

20 V
New
9.

SOUTHERN CLAIMS.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. DAVIS,

OF NORTH CAROLINA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 1878.

The House having met for general debate—

Mr. DAVIS, of North Carolina, said :

MR. SPEAKER: I have not often trespassed upon the attention of the House, and I would not do so now but for the fact that the section from which I come, its aims, and its purposes are being grossly misrepresented, not intentionally of course, by gentleman whose feelings and prejudices so warp their judgments that they can form no accurate estimate with regard to anything that relates to the South. It is made manifest by what we have heard time and again upon this floor, and by the utterances of the public press, that it is the purpose of the republican party to seek to regain its lost power in the North by re-arousing the passions and hatreds that were engendered by the war, and to this unhappy end there is a systematic and persistent attempt to show that it is the purpose of the South to get control of this Government and then bankrupt and destroy it, by what they are pleased to term "raids upon the Treasury with southern claims."

The gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HANNA,] in his speech commenting upon war claims, said, (I read from the RECORD:)

Ever since the suppression of the rebellion the persistence with which this class of claims has been pressed upon the attention of Congress has furnished well-grounded and grave fears in the mind of the people that it is the determined purpose of the democratic party in the event of ascendancy to compel the Government to assume and pay all losses and damages resulting from the prosecution of the war in defense of our nationality. Each succeeding year furnishes cumulative evidence in support of the truth of the charge that such is the well settled purpose of those who control the action of that party. For a time the approaches to the Treasury were cautious guarded, gradual, and well calculated to deceive the unsuspecting.

Now, sir, this is a broad and unqualified statement from the gentleman from Indiana. He then says:

I have carefully examined thirty-seven hundred and ten of the bills introduced and the abstract of the character stated of those referred to the Committee on War Claims, I will, by leave of the House, print as part of my remarks:

And the list is published, headed:

Abstract of war-claim bills introduced in the Forty-fifth Congress.

I have taken pains to count the list, and I find the number to be six hundred and thirty-one. To make this terrible array of long columns—six pages of the "Record"—

I find that bill No. 415, introduced by my friend from Tennessee, [Mr. Dibrell], has been repeated just fifty-four times; bill No. 582, by the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. Crittenden], four times; No. 878, by Mr. House, twenty-four times; No. 955, by my friend, Mr. Vance, eight times; No. 1025, by Mr. Turner, six times; No. 1030, by Mr. Carlisle, twenty-nine times; No. 1049, by Mr. Atkins, forty-nine times; No. 1722, by Mr. Giddings, nineteen times; No. 2568, by Mr. Williams, eight times, and No. 2780, by Mr. Carlisle, seventeen times.

Of course I will not do the gentleman the injustice to charge that this was done for the purpose of misleading anybody, but it does make the array look imposing, and then, too, it shows how careful was the "examination." But it so happens, as I am informed by my friend from Kentucky, [Mr. Caldwell], that bill 1049, introduced by Mr. Atkins, and which is divided by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. Hanna], into forty-nine parts, was reported back to the House from the Committee on War Claims, and the same bill, appropriating \$24,257 31, is charged again in the list to Mr. Caldwell, thus not only doubling the number many times, but doubling the amount. Now it seems to me that a little careful examination would have sufficed to show not only that Mr. Caldwell was reporting a substitute, but that the names of the parties were the same. How many more errors there are in the gentleman's "carefully prepared statement" I am unable to say, but I have added up the figures and I find the whole to amount to \$5,000,107 06. One would infer, naturally, from the gentleman's speech, that all those were Southern war claims—"rebel claims," as gentlemen call them—which the "controlling element of the Democratic party"—this is his language, not mine—intended to "extort" from the people by a "raid upon the Treasury."

I have already shown the means—I will not say the disingenuous means—by which these claims have been magnified; but that is not the worst of it; I have taken some pains to analyze the character of these claims, not as carefully perhaps as did the gentleman from Indiana and others on that side of the House, but still with sufficient care to find out some things that were strangely overlooked by them in their "careful" examinations. I find in the first place that only \$2,573,028 69 of the claims in the gentleman's schedule are from the late Confederate States. I find that ten of his bills are for loyal churches, seven of them in loyal States; one of the bills is for a loyal temperance society in a loyal State; two for loyal academies in loyal States, one for Touro almshouse in Louisiana (possibly this may have been some disloyal charity, I do not know how this is); one for the loyal State of West Virginia; one for an agricultural association in Kentucky.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had neither the time nor the patience to examine all the claims in the list published by the gentleman from Indiana with the minuteness and carefulness with which he professes to have done, but I have made quite an extensive inquiry in regard to them, and I have been able to find only one claim that originated during the war which is not that of some loyal person—most of them are for loyal Republicans. I find a few of them—not one in ten—are for property or services growing out of transactions subsequent to the war.

Now let us take a running review of the gentleman's list of war claims which are going to bankrupt the Treasury. Here it is. [Holding it up.]

To begin with, the very first we find on the list is a claim from the loyal state of Connecticut for \$8,655, first introduced into the Republican Forty-third Congress by Mr. Kellogg, a Republican; and next on the list is a claim for \$5,000 from the state of New Jersey. The next comes from Tennessee; there is not a claimant from that state who is not a loyal man. Then there is a claim from Pennsylvania—the state from which our Speaker comes. Then comes New York; and then Maryland with twenty-two claims, all in a bunch and, as I learn from my friend from Maryland, [Mr. Walsh,] they are all the claims of loyal men. Then comes Virginia. Then comes North Carolina, which is a little claim, but North Carolina has been very modest in this respect. Then Ohio comes for one-fourth of a steamboat. Then comes Pennsylvania for \$22,927; and then the loyal State of Kentucky with a long array of these claims and the bill H. R. No. 415 which is repeated fifty-four times on the list, and that claim as I learn from my friend [Mr. Dibrell] is for persons some of whom were soldiers and the widows of soldiers in the Union army—one of them a widow who lost her husband and two sons in the Union army.

Mr. Seales. What does the gentleman mean by saying that the claim has been repeated fifty-four times?

Mr. Davis, of North Carolina. I say that the bill has been repeated fifty-four times upon the list as you see it here, [holding it up,] of course not for the purpose of deceiving anybody, but to make the thing look large. Then comes Kentucky again, and then comes Indiana, the State from which the gentleman [Mr. Hanna] hails; and then comes Illinois, with a claim of \$20,000 for losses on account of the steamer S. C. Baker. Then comes the claim of A. L. H. Crenshaw, from Missouri, and that is an interesting case about which I wish to say a word.

This "war claim" was first introduced in the Forty-third Congress. It will be remembered that was a Republican Congress. There was a report made by Mr.

Cobb, a Republican, in which he gives the character of the claim. It was for fifty-five mules of which "he was robbed," I quote from the report, "by United States officers * * * in September, 1863, for the loss of which he claims the Government was rendered liable by subsequently taking possession of them. His claim was referred for investigation to a board of Army officers convened at Kansas City, Missouri, who, after full inquiry into the facts of the case, report that Crenshaw, a licensed cattle-dealer, * * * and an unconditional Union man, was the victim of a conspiracy organized by Lieutenant Lindsay, Eleventh Kansas Volunteers, Wiley Aiken, W. Logan, John Hampton, Andrew Hammond, and Major Plumb, provost marshal, * * * to rob him of his property." The report then details one of the most infamous conspiracies and robberies that ever disgraced humanity, and this is put to the charge of the South. The claim was reported favorably to the Forty-third Congress by Mr. Cobb, a Republican, and to the Forty-fourth by Mr. Eden, Democrat, and any one who wishes to read a dark page can find it in the report of the board of Army officers and in House report 819, Forty-fourth Congress, in which the outrages are detailed. Surely if the gentleman from Indiana had been a little more "careful" he never would have laid this claim to the South, and for humanity's sake he would have kept it out of view.

Then comes another long list from Missouri; then Tennessee again; then Ohio comes in for several thousand dollars; and then again comes in one introduced by my friend Mr. Carlisle, which is enumerated twenty-nine times upon this list, for some property belonging to Union men in Kentucky. Then comes Tennessee again, with loyal claims, and then follows Illinois with a claim for chattels furnished to the Union Army, and then comes in Michigan for \$62,480 for a steamboat, and then again Ohio, and then there are two cases from Massachusetts. Then comes a claim from Illinois, and then two from Pennsylvania, and then a number from the District of Columbia, and then New Jersey and Pennsylvania again, and then Massachusetts comes in again for property taken. Well, then comes in a claim from Tennessee for the destruction of a Presbyterian church, and I know that my colleague who sits near me [Mr. Scales] would be in favor of that.

Mr. Scales. Yes; if it is just.

Mr. Davis, of North Carolina. My friend knows that the Presbyterian Church would not present any claim that was not just. Then comes another claim from New York and another from Pennsylvania. I only enumerate these claims for the purpose of showing how utterly unjust is this charge about southern claims. I hold in my hand a Republican paper, the Cincinnati Commercial, containing a letter written from this city by a republican, giving an account of the claims introduced by Mr. Dibrell :

Mr. Dibrell, from the third Tennessee district, many of the counties of which had more men in the Union than in the Confederate army, and which counties are Republican to-day, has introduced this session thirty or forty bills for the payment of loyal men, some of them a mere pittance of a few hundred dollars, and none for very large amounts. Yet several Republicans have made speeches this session on "southern claims," and they have all paraded Dibrell's bills before the country as a part of the evidences of a rebel raid on the Treasury. I happen to have a large acquaintance in that district, and every man I know on Dibrell's list was a Union man, and stands ready to prove his Unionism. Some of them can prove it by scars on their bodies, received in the Federal service. I submit if this is just treatment of these men. One of Dibrell's claimants is now eighty years old; yet, old as he was, he served as captain in the Union army, and not only that, but piloted over five hundred men through the mountains into Kentucky on foot, and enlisted them under the flag of the Union, where they fought till the close of the war. He sacrificed his property for the Union cause. Yet this man's claim, along with others just as worthy and meritorious, is paraded around the country as a "rebel claim," and made to adorn the beautiful stump speeches that are to serve as campaign thunder in the North this fall. Dibrell was a "Confederate soldier," to be sure, but he has put in no claim for himself or for any fellow-confederate.

So much for the speech of the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. Hanna.] But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Hayes] came in with a long list of figures, and I have taken some pains to analyze his table also. Here is one introduced into the Senate by Senator Harris for the relief of James Clift, of Tennessee, and the same bill is introduced into the House by Mr. Dibrell, and repeated twice; that is, it is made to speak three times in the list. This James Clift was a captain in the Union army, and that is one of the disloyal claims that are going to bankrupt the Treasury. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I only know in regard to these claims what I learn from such information as I can gather from the bills and from gentlemen who introduce them. Here is one, for \$100,000, of Eugene Leitensdoerfer, of Missouri, for services rendered to Colonel Doniphan, in his great Santa Fe expedition, more than thirty years ago. I find also upon the list a bill for the removal of the political disabilities of somebody, and that is put down as a war claim. And if the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Illinois has examined the bills which they include in this array of southern claims, they would have found that more than one-third of them were for pensions to soldiers, and not one of them to a confederate. They would have found that nearly every one of these claims was the claim of a Union man.

There is a claim, and a large one, for \$135,500, for citizens of Bonham, Texas.

That is a large amount, but that claim originated fifteen months after the war. There was a Major Smith, I think his name was Smith, commanding United States troops at Brenham, in Texas, and his soldiers went to a colored ball, broke up the ball, and there was a riot, and the town was burned down. The proof goes to show that it was burned down at least with the sanction of the commanding officer. In a report to be found in Executive Document No. 145, third session of Forty-first Congress, will be found a full account of this case. It stamps Major Smith with infamy, and I have been told that afterward, not for this offense, however, he was dismissed from the Army, but I do not know how this is. He certainly ought to have been punished.

That is one of these claims which occurred long after the war and had nothing at all to do with the war. Five of these bills are for pensions to Mexican soldiers. Then comes my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. Lynde] with a bill for the widow of a Union soldier; and there is one for the relief of Alden M. Woodruff, of Little Rock, Arkansas, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Aldrich]; it is a bill for \$225,000. I would like to know what sort of a rebel in Arkansas the loyal gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Aldrich] would introduce a bill for? I apprehend it will not be found that he was a very disloyal man, for if he was the gentleman from Illinois would not seek to commend himself to the favor of his Republican constituents by introducing a bill for the relief of any such person. Then comes a bill for the relief of Hiram Johnson and others, the same which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Hanna] repeated so many times. Then there is one introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Hartridge] for the relief of James Johnson, late collector of the port of Savannah. That collector had a deputy collector, a loyal man, who ran away with some Government money.

By the way, I make here a statement, astounding as it may seem, and which I would not have believed if I had not found it to be so. During the last three or four Congresses there has been more money appropriated to meet embezzlements by subordinates in the employ of the Government than has been allowed for the whole State of North Carolina. Well, Johnson, the collector, wants relief for the money stolen by his deputy.

Then here is one introduced by my friend from North Carolina [Mr. Vance] for the relief of James Roberts. It is charged here to Mr. Ellsworth, my friend from Michigan, who reported it from the Committee of Claims. Then here is one which was introduced by my friend from Missouri [Mr. Crittenden] for the relief of certain soldiers of the Eighth cavalry, State of Missouri. He tells me that they were all Union men. Then I find one introduced by Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, for the relief of the heirs of General Count Pulaski. Now, I suppose that, Count Pulaski having fought in our first rebellion, it is thought right that the bill for his heirs should be charged to the South in this last rebellion. Then there is one introduced by Mr. Cook, of Georgia, for the relief of the tobacco trade. [Laughter.] There is one to authorize the erection of a light-house. Then there is a bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Throckmorton) for the relief of a gentleman who was entitled, as he alleges, to commissions under a contract for gathering up cotton.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Hayes] says in his speech that these claims amount to \$300,000,000. And he repeats that three times.

Now, I say that is such a mistake that it ought not to have gone out from this hall. All the claims put together, that have been introduced here by all the Representatives from the South, will not amount to anything like that. And if you put in all the appropriations for rivers and harbors and for the improvement of the Mississippi, they would not altogether make three hundred millions, nor one-tenth of it. Yet the gentleman says:

Why, sir, the idea that the Government owes and ought to pay all damages occasioned by the war throughout the South is so firmly imbedded in the Southern mind, that it will take several generations to root it out. No man, I care not how great his ability, can be a leader among the Southern people unless he openly indorses this idea. There is not a Southern gentleman on this floor who would not be overwhelmingly defeated at the coming election if he should dare to stand up here and declare that these claims ought not to be paid.

I am utterly astounded when I hear such statements. I defy the gentleman to name a man on this floor who ever said that he was in favor of making good all the damages sustained by the South in the war. I defy him to find a Southern man who has taken an oath to support the Constitution who ever claimed any such thing. I do not mean every one who will say that he was loyal, because I do not vouch for the loyalty of all those who claimed to be such during the war. But I defy him to find a man who fought in the Southern army, and who has sworn to support the Constitution, who will say that he is in favor of paying for all the damages so sustained. I know that it is sometimes stated that if the Democratic party gets into power the Government will be made to pay for all the negroes and other property lost by the South and even the confederate debts, and this has had some effect in some sections; but the charge is so absurd, so preposterous that the man who believes it is to be pitied for want of sense rather than censured.

I say there is not a man on this floor who would come back here from any district in a Southern state if he were to go there and declare that he was in favor of adding to the burden of debt now resting upon this Government by the payment of all the losses and damages sustained by the South in the late war.

The bills reported favorably by the republican Committee on War Claims at the first session of the Forty-third Congress were one hundred and eight, amounting to \$5,912,790. The number reported favorably at the first session of the Forty-fourth Congress by a democratic committee was fifty-one, and the amount \$215,361. These facts ought to show our northern friends that the Treasury is much safer in democratic than in republican hands.

But this is not all. Under the law no war claims can be paid to any but loyal people. Our republican friends would require democrats to be particularly observant of this law. Let us see what Mr. John Sherman, now Secretary of the Treasury, said in his campaign speech in Ohio in 1876:

When the war closed innumerable claims against the United States were made from the lately rebel States, and Congress in the most liberal spirit made provision for the payment of all that by the well-settled rules of civilized war could be properly made against the United States. The officers of the Departments, Supreme Court, the Court of Claims, and the Southern claims commission were authorized to adjust and pay different classes of claims, and Congress passed many acts for equitable relief; so that it may with safety be said that more than \$100,000,000 was paid after the war was over to citizens of the South for losses caused by the rebellion.

Now all this sum was paid of course by republicans, but since 1876 our republican friends have become more careful. In the seventh general report of the commissioners of claims, for instance, they have devised a long list of questions that would exclude from that court nearly every man and woman in the South who has any heart. There are twenty-two questions put to female claimants. One of them is:

Did you ever belong to any sewing society organized to make clothing for Confederate soldiers or their families, or did you assist in making any such clothing, or making flags or other military equipments, or preparing or furnishing delicacies or supplies for Confederate hospitals or soldiers.

This would exclude every good woman in the South. I never yet knew a woman who was not willing, when she could, to administer to the wants of sick soldiers in the hospitals, whether they were Confederate or Union soldiers. I can say that of a truth for the noble, generous women of the South. At my request, Mr. Smith, the excellent and efficient clerk to the Committee of Claims, has prepared a statement of the claims referred to that committee. I will not repeat the details, for, without doubling, it would make a list nearly as large as that of the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. Hanna]; but I can, with perfect safety, vouch for the accuracy of Mr. Smith, and I give the result as follows: Whole amount of claims, \$5,373,731.23, of which \$1,069,527 are from the North and only \$1,304,203.31, are from the Southern States. The States of Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland and this District are included in the Southern States.

Thus largely over one-third of the population of this country are represented before that committee by much less than one-fourth of the claims. And yet my friend from Iowa thought that little matter of \$43,000 that came from North Carolina was an evidence of the "southern raid" to bankrupt the Government. And when the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Reed] was making his speech the gentleman from Iowa felt it his duty to call attention to that enormous claim of the State of North Carolina, but he was sweetly oblivious to the fact that more than two-thirds of the claims before that committee were for northern people. If the gentleman had made an inquiry of our clerk he would have found that much the larger proportion of these claims belonged to the North in the proportion of nearly four to one, putting Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri with the South.

I am also indebted to my friend Mr. Smith for a statement showing that in the Forty-second (republican) Congress, bills were passed allowing claims to the amount of \$2,498,172 35, while the Forty-fourth (democratic) Congress passed only \$1,378,267 43, making \$1,119,904 93 more passed by the Forty-second (Republican) Congress than by the Forty-fourth (Democratic) Congress. This included claims from the Court of Claims, the Southern claims commissioners, and the Commissary and Quartermaster-Generals' departments. The whole amount of claims allowed other than those, by the Forty-second Congress was \$989,550 65, of which \$800,014 06 were from the North, and only \$129,536 44, or less than one-sixth, were from the South. Of the amount appropriated by that Congress \$62,019 15 were allowed for embezzlements of subordinates in the pay of the Government, that is to make good money stolen.

A similar statement for the Forty-third (republican) Congress shows whole amount of private claims allowed was \$2,541,238 65 and by the Forty-fourth (democratic) Congress, \$1,566,282 42, making a difference of \$974,956 23.

But that is not all; deducting the claims from the Court of Claims, the Southern claims commissioners, and the Commissary-General and Quartermaster-General's departments and the Forty-third Republican Congress paid claims to the North amounting to..... \$818,088 5
To the South amounting to..... 90,514 34

Excess to North over South..... \$727,574 31
That is more than nine to one. But that is not the worst. The Forty-Third Congress passed bills to the amount of \$247,968 28 to make good losses by the defalcations and embezzlements of subordinates for the relief of various officers. That is, leaving out the claims from the Court of Claims, Southern claims commissioners, and Commissary and Quartermaster-Generals' departments, the Forty-third Congress paid to relieve officers for defalcations and embezzlements..... \$247,968 28
For South..... 90,514 34

\$157,453 94

That is, if you exclude loyal claims, the Forty-third Congress allowed and paid (for it has all been paid) more money to make good such defaults as are contained in the extract below from Senate Report No. 236, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, than was paid to all the South. The report refers to bills to relieve officers for defaults (that is, the stealing) of deputies, etc.

These were the defaults of subordinates; there were millions that were never made good. Mr. Boutwell, Secretary of the Treasury, gives, in Executive Document No. 140, Forty-first Congress, third session, a "statement of balances due from collectors of internal revenue who were out of office on the 30th day of June, 1870." This statement was made on the 18th day of February, 1871. It shows the amount of balances on that day to be \$20,700,983 33. A portion of this was made good by the securities of the collectors and perhaps other sums were paid, but a large portion of it was never paid. Joshua F. Bailey, of New York, for instance, absconded March 15, 1870, nearly twelve months before the statement was made. He was behind nearly \$1,200,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have another table, which I have prepared, and which shows some interesting facts.

A comparative statement of the expenditures of the public money on account of miscellaneous expenditures during the Presidential election years 1864, 1868 and 1872, and the next preceding and the next succeeding year to each election, respectively:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES.

Fiscal year—	Amount.	Increase.	Decrease.
1863-64.....	\$27,572,216		
1864-65, election year.....	42,989,383	\$15,417,167	
1865-66.....	40,603,114		\$2,376,269
1867-68.....	53,009,867		
1868-69, election year.....	56,474,061	3,464,194	
1869-70.....	53,237,461		3,237,600
1871-72.....	60,484,757		
1872-73, election year.....	73,328,110	12,843,353	
1873-74.....	69,641,593		3,686,517

Showing an increase in the miscellaneous expenses of the Government for the three election years over the years preceding each to the amount of \$31,224,714 and an excess over the years succeeding each of \$9,300,386. I have compiled this statement from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the year 1876, and any one wishing to verify the figures can do so by referring to page 16 of that document.

It will be observed that in the Secretary's report for the year ending June 30, 1874, the amount is put down at \$85,141,593; but this includes \$15,500,000, as the Secretary says, expended under the Geneva award, which should be deducted, leaving the amount I have stated for that year. This is a statement of what the Secretary calls miscellaneous expenses only, and it is pretty good miscellany.

Now, let us examine the receipts and see how the accounts stand. Take the receipts from internal revenue:

Fiscal year 1867-'68.....	\$191,087,539
Fiscal year 1868-'69, election year.....	158,356,440
Fiscal year 1869-'70.....	184,800,756
Decrease.....	32,731,129
Increase.....	25,513,269

Showing the receipts for the election year to be over \$22,000,000 less than the year preceding, and over \$26,000,000 less than the year succeeding. These figures can be verified by reference to page 12 of the same report.

I have not referred to the last Presidential election, because the appropriations having been under the control of a Democratic Congress, our Republican officials were limited in their resources, and the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the year ending June 30, 1877, shows the net ordinary expenses of the Government to be \$144,209,963 against \$164,857,813 for the year ending June 30, 1876. That is a decrease in the ordinary expenses of the Government of just \$20,647,850; and this result is due to the Democratic House. These figures can be verified by reference to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the year 1877, page 17.

Is it simply a coincidence that during the three presidential years I have named the miscellaneous expenditures of the Government were largely in excess of the preceding and succeeding years? Is it a mere accident that the receipts from the internal revenue were more than \$32,000,000 less than the preceding and \$26,000,000 less than the succeeding year of the presidential election? No, they were not mere coincidences, not mere accidents; there was a reason for it, and it was this: the Republican officials acted and treated the government as if it had been the property of the Republican party. The revenue officers and marshals and agents of the government and all the machinery of the government all over the country, instead of being employed in the interest of the public, were employed in the interest of the Republican party, spending the public money to the amount of millions, thus increasing the expenditures, and neglecting the duties of their offices, and thus diminishing the receipts.

No one can estimate even approximately the loss to the government resulting from the maladministration of its affairs under Republican rule. I make the charge, and I propose to make it good, that if all the revenues of the government had been honestly collected and disbursed we would to-day be without a public debt.

According to the report made to the Forty-second Congress by the civil service commission appointed by President Grant, it is calculated "that one-fourth of the revenues of the United States are annually lost in the collection." This is the conclusion reported by seven distinguished gentlemen, Republican gentlemen, with George William Curtis at their head.

Any one who will take the pains to examine the statistics relating to the collection of customs and internal revenue will readily see that the estimate of Mr. Curtis and his associates as to the revenue lost to the government is not too high, and there has been but little improvement since their report. We have shown how the expenses have increased and the collections decreased during the years of presidential elections. The report of the Fifth Auditor for the year ending June 30, 1876, shows the aggregate internal-revenue assessments to amount to the sum of \$136,756,374.40, and the amount collected, \$115,417,747.33; difference between the amount assessed and the amount collected, \$21,338,627.07. Now there are no exemptions of any sort as against taxes, and there is no reason why the amount assessed should not be collected. The expenses of collecting this internal revenue amount to the godly sum of \$4,233,288.22; but where do these \$21,000,000 go? Is it lost by carelessness? How much of it is in the shape of abatements? And what are these abatements for? Do favorites and political partisans reap the benefit? Are the public or official morals of the country improved by it? Anyone who will examine the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1876, page 424, can verify the figures I have given. They need explanation.

But we have seen, from the highest Republican authority, the estimate that one-fourth of the revenue never finds its way into the Treasury, and I think they underestimate the loss. Now, if this is correct, and I think no one can doubt that it is below the mark, it can be shown from official data that enough has been lost to the Government to pay the entire national debt. This is a startling statement, but let us see if it is sustained. Any one who will take the pains to add up the figures to be found on pages eleven and twelve of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1877 will find that since the Republican party came into power the net ordinary receipts of the Treasury have been \$5,057,869,221 65, full nineteen-twentieths of which is derived from customs and internal revenue. This is a very large sum, and it is not easy to comprehend it, but we have seen that only three-fourths of the revenue finds its way into the Treasury, the other fourth is lost—lost by carelessness; lost by stealings; lost by neglect; lost by rings and combinations of rogues, of which the St. Louis disclosures, though showing millions in one city, was but as a drop in the bucket. Now, if \$5,057,869,221 65 be all that has gone into the Treasury, and that is, as we have shown from high authority, and no one ought to doubt the fact, only three-fourths of what ought to have gone there, by a very simple rule in arithmetic we can ascertain what the other fourth—the lost fourth—is; it is just \$1,685,956,407 21.

But this loss was through the period of Republican rule, and interest should be added in order to determine the full extent of it. This, by a fair estimate, will amount to at least \$800,000,000, making the aggregate over \$2,485,000,000. It will thus be seen that if the revenues of this Government had been fairly and honestly administered more than enough would have been saved to discharge the public debt. It is true that there would not now be quite so many millionaires, nor quite so many tramps and beggars, both to a great extent the legitimate growth of Republican

rule, produced by legislation in favor of a class against the interest of the million. There would be no bonds creating wealth to the amount of hundreds of millions that pays no tax, but is supported and maintained by tax upon the labor of the man. The incomes of some people would not be quite so large, but then they would be in labor under the fear of an income tax, for none would be needed. There would be no unjust taxes upon tobacco and the fruit of the orchard and other industries, for would not then be needed to pay the golden interest of the bondholder. Peace and happiness and prosperity would prevail throughout the land, and we should hear no strikes nor threats of labor vs. capital.

It is to divert attention from all these sins of commission and omission that the cry is raised against the South, and gentlemen from that section well understand that, and we wish our friends in the North not to be deceived by misrepresentations regard to the people of the South. Our people want peace; they wish to see prosperity again; they long and pray for a good and honest administration of the Government, and they despair of getting it until a change by dismissing from control the party that has had power for the last seventeen years.

Mr. Eden of Illinois. In reply to what has been stated in reference to the number of claims pending before the Committee on War Claims, I wish to state that in the Forty-third Congress there were reported by that committee private claims to the amount of \$396,891.63; for the Quartermaster-General, Commissary-General of Subsistence, and commissioner of claims, \$1,561,711.76; making the total amount reported \$1,959,603.39. That was a Congress in which our republican friends had control, as there was a larger number of claims before the Committee on War Claims than there was in the Forty-fourth Congress when the democrats had control. I will state further that in the Forty-fourth Congress the amount of private claims reported amounted to \$188,015.30, and the Quartermaster and Commissary-Generals and commissioner of claims \$943,713, the total amount reported being \$1,131,828.30. The war claims reported favorably by the republican committee of the Forty-third Congress exceeds the amount reported by the democratic committee of the Forty-fourth Congress over \$800,000!

Mr. Lockwood of New York. Mr. Speaker: I think it cannot be denied that every law or decision of the courts under and by virtue of which southern claims have been paid and under which payment is now claimed was originated and enacted by a republican Congress and interpreted by a republican judiciary, all the offices of the Government since the close of the war prior to the Forty-fourth Congress, legislative and executive, having been held by the republican party. In addition to passing all laws under which payment could be made, we find that the republican party, prior to 1871 had actually paid of the southern claims more than \$100,000,000.

And it would also appear that the republican party believed in paying all the claims. I quote from a speech delivered in the Senate of the United States by the late Senator Morton, a leader of his party:

Can we afford to make any other rule on this subject? We might save some money by making another rule; but it would in the end be penny-wise and pound-foolish economy. After having expended some \$5,000,000,000 to keep the South in the Union, and after all our labors build up a loyal party down there, shall we come here making shipwreck in the end by dealing upon the floor of the Senate that the loyal men whose hardships and sufferings we can never estimate should be treated as public enemies and that we will not pay them under the same circumstances under which we would pay a man for the taking of like property in the North? I can never consent to it.

The bills reported from the Committee on War Claims at the first session of the Forty-third Congress amounted to the sum of \$5,912,790. That was a republican Congress. The same committee of the Forty-fourth Congress, the first democratic Congress, at the first session reported bills favorably to the amount of \$215,361. The present Congress has not paid to exceed \$5,000 of southern claims and payment in these cases was urged by the republican side of the House. The case of the present Congress was the bill for the relief of William and Mary College, of Virginia. The ablest speech made in favor of its payment was by a republican from Massachusetts, and the leading speech against it by a democrat from Wisconsin, and strange to say this case which has provoked so much debate at this session of Congress and which has acquired such newspaper notoriety, was passed without serious opposition by the republican House of the Forty-second Congress.

The Southern claims commission was established by a republican Congress, and for the purpose of allowing and providing a way to pay, as its name indicates, southern claims.

These facts speak for themselves. Let the people who must pay the taxes judge for myself, I care not which party advocates the payment of southern claims; so long as my voice or vote can prevent their payment in the committee-room or in the House, I shall continue to oppose them. They are of the past and they should be permitted to remain as an inheritance and warning to evil-doers.